

16

A
CONFUTATION
OF
Some of the ERRORS
OF

Mr. Daniel Williams.

By the Reverend

Mr. Vincent Allop.

IN A
LETTER

To the Reverend

Mr. Daniel Burgesse.

LONDON

Printed for John Marshall, and Sold at the Bible in Newgate-street, and at the Bible in Grace Church street where is to be had the History of the Union between the Presbyterian and Congregational Ministers in and about London; And the Causes of the breach o it. 1698.

20.4 x 15.6
(5) 22 p

LIBRARY OF UNION
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY,
NEW YORK.
— GIFT FROM —
DAVID H. MCALPIN.

TO

Dr. McAlpin

Rev. Dr. McAlpin

TO

Dr. McAlpin

TO

Dr. McAlpin

Dr. McAlpin

TO THE
READER.

THough, in the ensuing Letter the Reverend Mr. *Alsop* is brought in Confuting some of thole *Errors*, which are in Mr. *Williams's* Writings, and have been Countenanced by his Subscription, and the Defence he has written for him; yet it ought not to surprize thee. For, it's Probable, he may plead Prescription, and upon this Foundation lay a claim to the Privilege of contradicting whatsoever himself saith, or doth. His subscription to the Testimonial before Mr. *Williams's* Book, Intituled, *Gospel Truth Stated*, in these words, *We*
A 2 Judge,

To the Reader.

Judge, that our Reverend Brother bath for the substance, Rightly Stated the Truth and Errors mentioned as such; then thus to it, that he bath in all that is Material, Rightly and Fully Stated them; And again his Declaration in the presence of Dr. Bates, Mr. How, and others, that he subscribed only to the Right stating of the Truths and Errors, thinking or believing, or not doubting, that there are Errors amongst what he calls Truth; and some Truths Represented by him to be Errors, and yet an Error as well as a Truth may be rightly Stated; These contradictions, as well as his Approving and Recommending the First Paper, then subscribing it, and yet with the greatest virulence exposing it; may serve instead of a Demonstration, that how surprizing soever they may be in another, they ought not to be so in him: And that his late seeming Tergiversations, Windings and Turnings are not so much to be heeded, but that still his Judgment is to be
mean

To the Reader.

measured by what he has in his *Anti-Sozzo*,
and must be so, until he *Retracts* and *Answers* it.

To which I will add, that I am of Opinion, the *Author* of the Letter doth not urge Mr. *Alsops Authority*, but his *Reasons*, which are, it must be owned, a Solid Confutation of those *Errors*, in Mr. *Williams's*, to which they are opposed. For Mr. *Alsops* Acting the Part of a *Fickle man* in forsaking the Faith he once Preached, cannot in the least weaken those Arguments, whose strength lyeth in their Conformity unto, and Agreement with the sacred Text. But notwithstanding the many different shapes he seems to have assum'd, I'll hope the best of him; that he has not Abandoned those Principles so freely own'd and strenuously proved by him, in his *Anti-Sozzo*, and that therefore the Letter is justly Stiled, A *Confutation* of some of Mr. *Williams's Errors* by the Reverend Mr.

VINCENT ALSOP.

THE
PUBLISHER
TO THE
READER.

THE *Author being perfectly unknown unto me, I can give no other Character of him than what he has given of himself in this Letter, However, I must do him Justice in desiring thee to Correct one considerable mistake in pag. 8. line 3. and for, [what hath Infatuated an Alsop,] read [what hath Influenced an Alsop.]*

To the Reverend

Mr. *Daniel Burgesse.*

S I R,

THE Matters in Difference between Mr. *Daniel Williams*, and his Opposers, as we gather out of his *Books*, compared with what hath been Written against him, is not as has been Represented to us, meerly about *Words*, and Different *Modes* of Expression ; but about *Things* of the Nearest Concernment to our *Salvation* : And the *Menage* of the *Contest*, on our part, so odd, that unless our Brethren in the City, do *Directly*, and with *Great Plainness*, *Testify* against the Errors found in his *Writings*, the Scandal, under which we shall all fall, will, with its Consequences, be much greater than the *Wifest* of us can *Foresee* ; Though, God knows, it is already such, as makes us sink in the Esteem of Men of Good Learning and Sobriety. For, Sir, the Errors he hath vented if they are not the *same* with, they are so like to the Impious Opinions of *Socinus*, in several Points, that the more Exact our Examination is, the more apt we are to take 'em for *Socinian* ; or, at least, for what is Adjusted to Prepare the Way for their more Kind Reception

B

and

and Entertainment. And to speak Impartially, He hath, with an Industry Unparallel, and with all the *Art* and *Cunning*, together with an Heretical Freedom of *Saying* and *Unsayi*ng; of Subscribing and Renouncing, as it is for his Purpose, one while appearing in the Light, and again taking his turns in the Darker Shades; Gained; he has, I say, gain'd such an Interest amongst our Brethren in *Bishops gate-street*, as to Conciliate some to his Notions, others to his Person, and all of 'em to A&T, as if they were entirely of his Mind: And is it not wonderful to observe, how almost all of you are wheedled into a Silence, and Consequently into a Tacit Approval of what you Abhor, by a Man, that Exceeds not his Brethren, either in Learning, or Vertue, or any thing else that can, without a Blush, be so much as mentioned; and who is no more, nor no longer ours, than his Interest, which made him to be so, doth Influence; For He is as much, and no more a *Presbyterian*, than the Present Controversy is about *Church-Discipline*, which Representation, he has made of it, is as Remote from Truth, as his Heart was from *Union* with the Congregational Brethren, when he declared, That whilst he Liv'd, he would have nothing to do with them. For, although he has got an Advantage from the *Independents* absenting themselves from the *Monday-Veeting* in *Bishops gate-street*, which he has Improved to the Persuading Divers of our Number to believe, that they have wickedly Designed, and are Craftily Endeavouring the Subversion of our Church-Government, yet it is as manifest as the Light at Noon, That He is most Incessant in his Labours to Possess us with an Opinion, That He is a *Presbyterian*, for no other Ends than to take you off from a Severe Examination of his Writings, and from your giving a Just and Necessary Testimony against his Errors; wherein he hath been so successful as to Prevail with most of you

you to Joyn with him in the Cry, that the Differences amongst you, are only about some Late Invented Terms and Phrases, or Peculiar Modes of Expression, or Methods of Explaining the Truths, in which you are, as to the Substance, Agreed; Or, at most, about Tything the *Mint*, *Anise* and *Cummin* of Religion, so Remote are they from affecting the weightier matters of Faith, whence it's commonly Demanded, To what purpose is there so much Noise and Pother made? What hath Mr. *Williams* done? Of what Nature are the Errors, with which he is Charged? Why are they not Assigned? They have been Assigned, first by six Independent Ministers in a Paper sent to your Meeting in *Bishopsgate-street*; Then by Mr *Chauncy*, in his *Neonomianism Unmask'd*; Afterwards by Mr *Lobb*, in a Paper delivered to several of our Brethren, as in the late History of the Union, p. 28. But that you may see what provokes me, I will, without Exaggeration, set down some of his Erroneous Opinions, in his own words; Show their Agreement with the *Tenets* advanced by the Enemies to Christ's Truths, and how strenuously the Learned and Reverend *Father Alsop*, has, in his *Answer* to a *Socinianizing* Gentleman, I mean in his *Anti-Sozzo*, confuted Mr. *Williams*.

SECT. I. About the *Eternity* of the Death threatned against Sin.

The Notion Mr. *Williams* hath Espoused about the Eternity of the *Threatned Punishment*, is such as the Disciples of *Episcopius*, and Men of the *Racovian Twang*, have, in their Attempts to subvert the Doctrine of *Christ's Satisfaction*, Advanced. For, as these Gentlemen do make the *Threatned Death*, in its first Consideration to be *Eternal*, as such; so doth He; whence it follows, That Christ could not suffer

for the Punishment, we Deserved, because that was *Eternal Death*; and Christ's Sufferings were but for a Time. So Socinus, in Crellius. *Id quod nos pati merebamur erat mors aeterna, quam Christus nec sustinuit, nec sustinere, Decreto Divino obstante Potuit. Crel. Respons. ad Grot. Cap. 9. Partic. 1.* And Curcellæus, *Christus non est Passus mortem æternam, quæ erat Pœna Peccato Debita. Nam paucis tantum horis in Cruce pependit, & tertia die Resurrexit ex mortuis, quod nullam cum æternitate Proportionem habet. Relig. Christo Instit. lib. 5. cap. 19. Sect. 16.* And so,

Mr. Williams.

The Threatning of the Law was Eternal Death, as Eternal Eternity was an Ingredient in the Misery of Every Sinner. Man made Right. p. 14.

Father Alsop.

‘ Let none say, if Christ bore the Punishment due to sin, he must suffer *Eternal Death*, seeing no less was due to our Transgressions: For, (1.) The Eternity of Punishment, is only due to Sin by Accident, as it is found in a Finite Person, who being not able to bear at Once, or in the Longest time, that Wrath, which his Sins have Demerited, Divine Justice Exacts of him an Eternity of Suffering: (2.) Whereas sin is only Infinite, or of Infinite Demerit, Objective, as committed against an Infinite God: The Sufferings of Christ are also Infinite Subjective, being the Sufferings of that Person, who is God, tho not as God; and therefore Christ in a Finite Time, was Able to give Infinite Satisfaction. *Anti-Soczo, p. 596.*

Sect.

SECT. II. The Next Point is about a *Change of the Penal Sanction of the Law*. An Error of such a Nature, as hath a Fatal Influence on our Ministry, and the Lives and Conversations of Men. For, if the *Penal Sanction* of the Law be changed for another, an Evangelical, and less Severe Threatning, then it must unavoidably Follow, that the *New Threatning* cannot be against any but such as are Transgressors of *that Law*, to which it is Annexed, and the Eternal Curse only against them, who do not so far Obey it, as to get a Right and Title unto Glory ; so that *Original Sin*, which was committed Antecedently to the giving of *this Law*, falls not under its Lash, and the *Old Sanction* being Vacated, we who are only under the *New*, not a Man of us is liable unto wrath upon it's Account ; Nor doth any other Sin but *Final Impenitence*, *Regnant Hypocrisie* and *Unbelief* expose the Soul to Gods Curse. The *Drunkenness*, the *Adultery*, the *Murder of a David*, the *Hypocrisie*, the *Lying*, the *Perjury*, the *Envy*, the *Malice*, and what sin soever else is, in Mr. *Williams's* Opinion, consistent with the Truth of Grace, tho in the Lowest Degree, falls not under the *Curse* of the Gospel. If these Abominations are Committed by some of his *Saints*, they cannot make 'em liable to Gods Wrath, nor to any Curse at all, if what he saith be true. For the Preaching of the *Old Law*, for Conviction of sin, is a Crime ; As if the Apostle *Paul*, when he said, *Cursed is every one, that continueth not in all things, which are Written in the Book of the Law, to do them*, Gal. 3. 10. And when he Cryed out, Rom. 7. 9. *I was alive without the Law once*, but when the Commandment came *Sin Reviv'd*, and *I Dy'd* ; had been at that time, under the *Old Jewish Dispensation* ; For we have, with Mr. *Williams*, no other Law to Preach for Conviction of sin, but the *New Gospel Law*.

Sir, that I abuse not this *Haughty Leader* of our Brethren, I will Prove, that *Crellius*, and He are one in this Opinion ; and that he differs from Father *Alsop*.

Crellius, Mr. *Williams*.

I. *Crellius*, That under the Gospel there are *Abatements* of Gods Anger against sin, that most direful Sanction, *Cursed is every one that continueth not to do all things*, as in *Gal. 3. 10. Deut. 27. 26*. Is taken away, and that softer one, He that *Believeth not*, shall be *Damned*, set up in its Place *Sub Evangelio sustulit severissimam illam Legis, Mosaica sanctionem, Maledictus omnis, &c. Gal. 3. 10. &c. Deut. 27. 26. Loco ejus hanc Reponens, qui non credit, &c. Mar. 16. 16. John 3. 18, 36. Crell. de Deo Lib. 1. Cat. 23*. But secondly, Mr. *Williams* expresseth himself as cleverly in his *Pref. to Gospel Truth Stated*. ‘The Gospel hath another Sanction to the Preceptive Part of the Law, than the Covenant of works had. Tho nothing be Abated in the Rule of Sin, and Duty, yet Blessings are Promised to Lower Degrees of Duty. He also tells us, that the Threatning is not against Every Degree of Sin ; so in the Defence of Gospel Truth, p. 30. ‘The Gospel Law doth not Denounce Death for the same sins, as Adams Law did ; That Law threatned Death for the least sin, yea, for one sin. But the Gospel Threatens Death not for every sin——Most of the threatnings in the Bible, that refer to the State of Souls are Evangelical threatnings. They are not by the Sanction of the Law of Innocence, -but of Gospel Grace——Every Threatning used by God as an Argument to Conversion, is a Gospel Threatning. Gospel Truth, p. 133, 134. There is a Legal Preaching, which is opposed to the Gospel ; and this indeed is a Crime ; And to that this Chapter Refers——Then he sets it down as a Truth, ‘That the Legal Preaching, which

‘which is a *Crime*, is to Preach the Law as a Covenant of *Innocency*, or Works——The Real Difference between *Do-
 ctor Cr.* and himself, is, ‘Whether it be *Legal* (in the Culpa-
 ‘ble Sense) to threaten such *Penalties*, as are short of Dam-
 ‘nation, against such Offences as are *Consistent with Sincerity*,
 ‘and yet avoidable by *Serious Care and Diligence*. This he
 denies. It is not *Legal Preaching* (*saieth he*) in a Culpable
 Sense, to threaten such *Penalties*, as are short of *Damnation*,
 against such Offences as are *Consistent with Sincerity*. But
 to Threaten these *Sins* with *Damnation*, that is *Legal Prea-
 ching*, which must not be endured; And why must not the
Sins which a Believer, consistently with *Sincerity*, commits,
 be threatened with *Damnation*? The Reason is Manifest.
 The *Sanction* of the Law of *Innocence*, which did threaten
 the least Sin, Every Sin with *Damnation*, is vacated, and
 made void: And the Gospel threatens *Damnation* against none
 but them who Die in *Final Unbelief*, and *Impenitence*. But
 what *Sins* are, or rather, what *Sins* (doth he think) are not
 consistent with *Sincerity*? I presume he can’t be of *Opini-
 on*, that *Lying*, or *False Accusing*, *Reviling*, or *Reproaching*
 his Innocent Brethren, or acting the Part of a *Delator*, or *I-
 risb Evidence*, are inconsistent with *Sincerity*; and therefore
 it must be a Sin to threaten *Damnation* against these Harm-
 less Abominations, if committed by himself.

Sir, This is such a Peice of *Antinomianism*, a Doctrine so
Licentious and vile, yea, such a Consecration of the most
 Villanous Practices, that it Amazes the most Solid and
 Grave Divines amongst us, to understand, that not a man of you
 hath the Courage to Witness against this Mans Abominations.
 What! when the Foundations are struck at? To look on, be
 silent and revile them, who are hardy enough to write a-
 gainst this Man! What can the Orthodox Divines of the
 Church of *England*, *Scotland*, and beyond the Seas, or what
 will

will *Posterity* think of these things? What is it that shuts up the Mouths of our *Gravidee's*, of a *Bates*, a *Howe*, a *Veal*, a *Glascock*? And what is it that hath *Infatuated* an *Alsop*, together with the whole Assembly in *Bishopsgate-street*, that they must become Advocates for a Man who Publisheth such *Licentious* and *Libertine Principles* as these? No wonder our Ministry is no more successful, when we make the Preaching of the Law void; I mean, the *Old Law*, under whose Curse all that Remain in Unbelief, still are; and which makes the *Sins* of the best on Earth to be Obnoxious to Damnation. Upon which Account we may, yea, we must threaten the sins of Believers themselves with Damnation, assuring them, that unless, when they sin they flee to Christ, their sin will be their Ruine. For there is no change of its Threatnings, no Mitigation, or Abate-ments. The least sin is as much of a Damning Nature as ever, which makes it necessary for him, who commits the sin, Exercise Repentance towards God and Faith in our Lord Jesus for Pardon. The [*Do this and Live; Sin and Dye*] is so much in Force, that without a full satisfaction to the Threatning Part of the Law, and a Righteousness fully Answering the [*Do this*] there can be no Life attain'd unto by any of us, and it is our Duty to Preach the Law of Innocency, and Denounce its Curse against all that abide in Unbelief, and against the *Sins* of Believers themselves. This is the Doctrine of *Protestants*, of the *Fathers* and *Blessed Apostles*. But I will go on to show the difference there is between Mr. *Williams*, and Father *Alsop* Distinctly, in these Points.

Mr. *Williams*.

The threatening of the Law was *Eternal Death*, as *Eternal*. *Eternity* was an Ingredient into the misery of every

every Sinner, and can be removed by nothing but the
Lawgivers Dispensing there with; upon *Considerations equal-
 ly Vindicating the Glory*, as this Eternity of Sinners Tor-
 ments would do. *Man made Right.* p 14.

Note, the *Dispensation* is of the *Penalty* to be suffered,
 and not only as to the *Person* suffering.

Father *Alsop.*

I would observe, That he supposeth God to have *Dis-
 pensed with the Moral Law*: which is News to me, and I
 confess I do not believe it, nor shall I, till I have it con-
 firm'd. Some Errors, though *Speculative*, are Damna-
 ble, and such may this Prove: For, if we, like *Fools*, Gog-
 gled in with the Rhetorical Divinity of this Age, should
 Trust to God's *Abatements of his Law*; and at last it
 should Prove, That God Loved *Righteousness*, and Hated
Iniquity, as such, we were in a most Wretched, Milera-
 ble and Undone Condition. meerly by Trusting to *Indul-
 gence* ——— How much of this Law God will *Dispense*
 with, what Part of it, or what Degrees of the Violation
 of it, is to me unknown; and if with any, whether he
 may not Possibly Dispence with the whole by the same
 Reason, is more than our Author's Principles can inform
 me. He that may *Dispense* with One Part of it, may with
 an other, and so of the Rest. For, where to stop, or put
 Bounds to such a *Dispensation* as comes from the *Grace of*
 God, is very Impossible to Determine, unless we knew the
 true Bounds of God's Grace. *Anti Sozzo*, p. 687, 688.

Mr. *Williams.*

Though Nothing be Abated, in the Rule of Sin, and
 Duty, yet *Blessings* are promised to *Lower Degrees of Duty.*
 Pref. to *Gosp. Tr.* p. 6. D Fa

Father Alsop.

‘ I do not find that God has Abated any thing of his Law,
 ‘ but is as Peremptory as ever; For, [*Do this and Live*].
 ‘ Nothing will please God, less than Exact and Perfect Obe-
 ‘ dience; tho in the Covenant of Grace, He is pleased to ad-
 ‘ mit another, a Mediator to do it for Believers: I would
 ‘ rather he would hear the Reverend and Learned Bishop
 ‘ Reynolds, upon Psal. 110. p. 492. In point of Validity, or
 ‘ Invalidity, there can be but five things said of the Law.
 ‘ 1. Either it must be Obed, and that it is not, Rom, 3. 23.
 ‘ Or, 2. It must be Executed upon Men, or the Curse, and Pe-
 ‘ nalty thereof be Inflicted; and that it is not neither, Rom.
 ‘ 8. 1. Or, 3. It must be Abrogated, or Extinguished; and
 ‘ that it is not neither, for Heaven and Earth shall sooner
 ‘ pass away. — Or, 4. It must be Moderated, and that it
 ‘ cannot be neither; For, it is Inflexible, and one Jot, or Tit-
 ‘ tle must not be Abated Or, Lastly, The Law it self Re-
 ‘ maining; the Obligation thereof notwithstanding, must
 ‘ towards such, or such Persons, be so far forth Dispensed
 ‘ withal as that a Curery shall be Admitted — both to Do
 ‘ all the Duties, and to suffer all the Curses of the Law, in
 ‘ behalf of that Person, who in Rigor should have done, or
 ‘ suffered it; so that the Law, nor One Jot, or Tittle there-
 ‘ of is abrogated in regard of the Obligation, therein con-
 ‘ tained but they are all Reconciled in Christ. Thus far Fa-
 ‘ ther Alsop in his *Anti Soczo*, p. 216, 217 who hath clear-
 ‘ ed it, that there are no Abatements in the Law, no Dis-
 ‘ pensing, either with the Commandment, or with the Penalty,
 ‘ but only as to the Person. And Grotius has Evinc’d, That
 ‘ though it be Essential unto Punishment, that it be for Sin,
 ‘ yet is it not Essential unto it, that it be on the Person, that
 ‘ sinned; and the Learned Bishop adds (as I have it, page
 396,

396, 397.) ' That in the *First Covenant* we were to do it in *our own Persons*; in the *Second* Christ is appointed, and allowed to do it *for us*. He fulfilled All the Obligations of the Law; the Duties thereof by *Active Obedience*, in his Life, and the Curses thereof by *Passive Obedience* in his Death. One more, Father *Alfop*. Though God hath not Abated of his Law, yet he hath Admitted a Surety, called, therefore the Surety of the Covenant. . . . *Anti-Soz. p. 699.*

Mr. Williams.

' The Gospel-Law doth not Denounce Death for the same Sins as *Adam's Law* did, that Law threatned Death for the Least Sin, yea, for One Sin; but the Gospel threatens Death, not for Every Sin. *Def. of Gospel-Truth*, p. 30 Well then, seeing the Gospel-Law doth not threaten Death against Every Sin, and the threatning of *Adam's Law* is vacated, or at least Dispensed with, Every Sin deserves not Death. For though the Desert of, and Obligation to Punishment, are Distinct; and the Obligation may be where there is no Desert, yet wherever the Desert is, there the Punishment is due, and the Person obliged to undergo it, till by an Application of Christ's Blood, that Obligation be Dissolv'd. The Sins which are Committed, and Deserve Punishment, if they Oblige not thereunto, there is no need, if there is no Reason for Pardon, which lyeth in a Dissolving the Obligation, For, where there is no Obligation, there can be no Dissolving it; and where no Threatning, there no Obligation; for an Obligation to Punishment, is by Vertue of the Threatning of the Law. Thus, he must hold, that no Sins but *Final Unbelief*, and *Impenitence*, falling under the Threatnings of the Gospel-Law, can need a Pardon; and these he allows shall never be Pardoned, or at least those Sins, which are consistent with Sincerity, or the Imperfections

tions of our Faith, Repentance and Obedience, need not a Pardon, because they fall under no Law Threatning, against which Notion I may Justly set down what hath been Asserted by,

Father Alsop.

‘ God is by Nature a *Holy God* ; as he is Governour of
 ‘ the *World*, he is a *Righteous Judge*. Sin is both contrary
 ‘ to his *Holy Nature*, and his *Holy Law* : And therefore as a
 ‘ *Holy God* he cannot but *hate Sin* ; as a *Righteous Judge* he
 ‘ cannot but *Punish Sin* : And because this Sin is *Inherent*
 ‘ in, and *Committed* by Man, God *hates the Sinner* upon
 ‘ the account of *his Sin* ; his *Person*, and his *Best Services*
 ‘ are an *Abomination to the Lord*. From Hence it follows,
 ‘ That Sin being a *Transgression of the Law*, in its *Preceptive*
 ‘ *Part*, renders the *Sinner Guilty*, that is, *Obnoxious*, and
 ‘ *Liable to the Law* in its *Sanction*, to the *Punishment*.
 ‘ Now this *Righteous Judge* will certainly *Charge* the
 ‘ *Guilty Sinner* with the *Penalty due to his Sin* : But
 ‘ *there is a way found out*, That he may not *Impute to Sin-*
 ‘ *ners their Transgressions*, ——— which is *by Christ* ; and,
 ‘ as he adds, *by his being made Sin for us*. *Anti-Sozzo*,
 p. 631.

Mr. Williams.

‘ That *Legal Preaching*, which is a *Crime*, is to Preach
 ‘ the Law as a *Covenant of Innocency*, or *Works*—— E-
 ‘ very *Threatning* used by God to Conversion is a Gospel
 ‘ *Threatning*. *Gospel Truth stated*, p. 222, and 133, 134.
 So that it’s *sinful* to endeavour to Convince Men of their
 Sin and Misery, by Preaching to them the Law of Works,
 that is to say, *Adam’s Law* ; but we must confine our selves
 wholly

wholly unto the Gospel Law, the very Error held by *Agricola Islebius*, the *Antinomian*, and Confuted by *Luther*.

Father *Alfop*.

' The Law is God's Law, and when it witnesseth to a sinner, it witnesseth home, *convinces* him of the *Perfect Holiness* of that God, who gave the Law ; of the *Peremptoriness* of God, in not *Abating* One *Yot*, or *Tittle* of the Law ; of the *sinners utter Inability* to come up to the *Demands* of the Law ; and therefore the *utter Impossibility* of being Justified by the Law ; of the *Severity* of God's Justice in *Punishing* the Violaters of his Law ; and therefore unless he can find *another Righteousness*, he must *utterly perish*. 'Tis true, the Law speaks its Old Language still, *Do this, and live* ? but then it speaks it only to those who are upon the *Bottom* of *Innocency* ; for to a *Transgressor*, its Language is, *Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things*, *Anti-Sozzo*, p. 544 In *Rom. 7. 13.* it's said, *I had not known sin, except the Law had said, thou shalt not covet.* From whence I Argue : By that Law, which says, *Thou shalt not covet*, comes the *Knowledge of sin* ; Therefore by the *Moral Law* comes the *Knowledge of sin*. The *Major* is the *Apostle's own*, in the place last Quoted ; The *Minor* needs no Proof, but that a Man be able to Read the *Ten Commandments*, which is the *Summ* of the *Moral Law*, the Tenth whereof is, *Thou shalt not covet.* *Anti-Sozzo*, p. 538.

The Knowledge of Sin being by the Law, which saith, *Thou shalt not covet*, and which saith, *The Man that continueth not in all things* is Accursed : That we may Convince Men of their Sin, and Misery, and of the Necessity of Believing in the Lord Jesus, that they may, by his Righteousness, Receiv'd by Faith, be Justify'd ; We must Preach to

E

them

them this Law, and Denounce the Threatned Curse thereof. This is the Doctrine of Protestants, this the Doctrine Taught us by the Holy Apostles. On the other hand, if with Mr. *Williams*, we must confine our selves in our Attempts to convince sinners unto the Gospel Law, how can we charge them with the Guilt of *Original Sin*, or Threaten Death against them, for any other sins, than their Unbelief and Impenitence? An Error so Gross, so Absurd and Pernicious to the Souls of Men, that it becomes Every Good Man to Express his Abhorrence of it.

But, as if the Design was, That Men of our Way may Deservedly fall under the Reproach and Scandal of Sheltering, Supporting, Aiding and Abetting a Real *Antinomian*, who, that he may cover his mischievous Purposes, makes a frightful Out-cry against *Antinomianism*, not a Man of our Number but your self, that I know, Opposes them, so far as to lie under the Rage of these *snarling* Scriblers.

Sect. III. Of Procuring and Purchasing the Covenant of Grace.

One Great Point in Controversie between the *Reformed Churches*, and the *Remonstrants*, was, Whether Christ by his Death did *Procure*, *Purchase* and *Merit* a New Covenant of Grace? The *Remonstrants* Positively Affirm'd, That Christ did by the *Merit* of his *Death*, and *Satisfaction*, Procure and Enact a Covenant of Grace with sinners. The *Reformed Churches*, in Opposition unto them, were as Express, 'That Christ did not Merit the New Covenant of Grace, but that he was the chief Blessing of this Covenant, Promised in *Gen. 3. 15.* from whom all other Covenant Blessings, such as Reconciliation with God, Remission of Sins, and Eternal Life did as from their Fountain flow; That God in Renewing this Covenant with *Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David*, and the

‘ the other Patriarchs and Prophets, in the Old Testament, did
 ‘ first make mention of Christ, as the Seed, in whom their
 ‘ Posterity, together with all Nations, are Blessed. That in
 ‘ regard hereunto it is, that Christ is called a Mediator of
 ‘ the New Covenant, *Heb.* 8. 6. ch. 9. 15. ch. 12. 24. For
 the Mediator of the New Testament, and the Promise of this
 Mediator, must belong to the New Covenant of Grace. *Judic.*
Theol. Exterior. de quinq; Artic. Synod. Dordrech. Exhib. an. 1619.
pag. 117, 118.

Now it must be yielded, That a Great Deal turns on this
 Point; for from this Notion of the Remonstrants, it doth, saith
 the Learned Voetius (*Select. Disp. Theol. Par. 2.* (not pag. 133.
 as Mr. Lobb, in his *Defence*, p. 23. cites it) but pag. 233, &c.
 follow, ‘ That Christ was not truly our Sponsor; That he did
 ‘ not suffer in our Place and Stead; nor did he in a proper sense
 ‘ Purchase, Merit, or Procure any Blessings for us: which, is,
 we know, *Socinianism* all over; notwithstanding which Mr.
Williams falls in entirely with it; but Father *Aisop* as bravely
 Opposes it.

Mr. Williams.

‘ Still remember, that the Merits of Christ are the Cause
 ‘ of this Gospel Ordination; [viz. of this Covenant of
 ‘ Grace] *Pref. to Gosp. Tr. stat. p. 9.* Christ by his Righteousness
 ‘ did not only Purchase a Conditional Grant of the Saving Ef-
 ‘ fects; (viz.) that Proposition, *He that believes shall be saved.*
Gospel-Truth, p. 39. And, in his Man made Righteous, p. 103.
 ‘ Christ by His Blood Purchased the better Covenant with
 ‘ all its benefits.

Fa-

Father *Alfop*.

‘ We have heard of *Procuring, Meriting, Founding* a Covenant, but not a *Syllable* of Evidence. *Anti-Sozzo*, p. 716.
 ‘ I find frequent Assertions of this Doctrine. That the Covenant of Grace is Owing *to, Procured by, Founded on the Obedience of Christs Life, and the Sacrifice of his Death---*
 ‘ and yet I cannot find any *Proof*; and therefore (till I see Evidence to the contrary) I shall take it for granted that the Covenant of Grace is owing *to, founded on, and given forth by* that Free Grace of God, from which it is Justly Denominated a Covenant of Grace, though the Intervention of a Mediator, such a Mediator, was Absolutely necessary to put us into the Actual Possession of those Rich Mercies Designed for us by God in the Covenant; which Mediator himself is owing *to, founded on* that Covenant of Grace; and therefore the Covenant of Grace is not founded upon him. *Anti-Sozzo*, p. 586. See Page 705. from line 15, &c. And p. 718. ‘ Christ cannot be the Foundation of the Covenant, because Christ himself is Promised in the Covenant, as the Great Comprehensive Blessing of the Covenant. *Esa* 49. 8. 9. He tells us, That God for Christs sake has entered into a Covenant, made a Covenant, his Righteousness and Obedience have procured a Covenant, are the Meritorious cause of a Covenant; when the total Summ of all is no more than this, that God has Promised to Pardon, and save us if we believe and obey the Gospel, tho we obey not Perfectly, p. 695.

Sect. IV. Of the Nature of the Covenant of Grace.

Mr. Williams, tho he hath suck’d in *Arminian* Notions, could never possess himself of *Arminian* Accuracy and Learning, and tho he was given to Books ever since he was five Years Old,
 and

and Regularly Admitted into the Ministry at eighteen, so Great his Proficiency in Divinity as not only to Attone for what would have been in another an Irregularity, but to make it very Regular, yet it must be acknowledged that, in his hast to the Theological English System, he skip'd over his *Logick*, as is manifest from the Description he hath given of the *Covenant of Grace*, which he doth with a great Deal of Formality, and Pomp. For Placing himself in his Doctors Chair, He very Gravely Asks;

Q. *What is the Covenant of Grace?* And in Answer he saith,
 ' By *Covenant of Grace* I mean, the Way that God hath
 ' Ordained to Apply to Sinners that Salvation, which is
 ' Prepared by Christ, and which he will Enable the Elect to
 ' Comply with; which being to the Question *Quid Sit*, one might reasonably Expect to find in it somewhat of the Nature of a Covenant in General, and what doth in special constitute it a Covenant of Grace. But not a word of these things; not a word of the *Genus* of the thing defined; nor of it's *Specifick* Difference, or of what is Proper and Peculiar to the Covenant of Grace, Distinguishing it from other Covenants. ' It is (saith he) a way *Ordained of God* ' to Apply Salvation unto Sinners. But doth the Word [*Way*] denote to us any thing of the *Nature of a Covenant*, or what word in the whole Answer Import what is Peculiar to a Covenant of any kind or sort? Here is a Covenant, which, so far as we can Judge of it, is without any Parties Covenanting, yea, without any Pact, or Agreement, or Terms and Conditions; and may as aptly Contain in it the Nature of what is Distinct from a Covenant of Grace, as, well as the Nature of such a Covenant. And if I Guess Right, the Account he gives of the Covenant of Grace in Particular is much the same with what the Gentlemen at *Racow*, give of Religion in General, which is in these

F

words,

words, *Religio Christiana est Via a Deo per Jesum Christum Demonstrata, vitam eternam Consequendi*, and who can with any tolerable *Appearance* of Reason say, that the Christian Religion is not the *Way*, that God hath ordained to Apply to Sinners that Salvation, which is Prepared by Christ; and which he will Enable the Elect to Comply with? The same may be said of *Preaching the Word*, of *Faith in Christ*, of the *Bless'd Sacraments*, and the like things of another kind. For, these are *ways*, Ordained of God to Apply salvation unto Sinners, and according to this Definition (seeing *cui convenit Definitio, ei Convenit et Definitum*) they must all of them be Covenants of Grace. Now, if *Faith* be the *Covenant of Grace*, what is it's Condition? If the *Sacraments* be the *Covenant of Grace*, what are it's Seales? This is one *Specimen* amongst many of Mr. *Williams* his Profound skill in *Logick*; I say amongst many other which in Faithfull Rebuke's, High Applauses of the man, and Rude Demands, may Provoke some one or other to expose; and and the rather, if Possible, to Provoke the more Learned and Grave Fathers of our way, to Consider what manner of man it is, to whose Conduct they have tamely submitted themselves.

But to make the most of what he saith, of the Gospel Covenant in this *chapter*, it amounts to no more than that the *Remission of Sins is Promised to Faith and Repentance*; or that the *Benefits of the Covenant are Promised to all that submit to the Terms of it*. *Gospel Truth*. p. 68, 69. That the use and Interest of Gospel Conditions is, but in a Degree from the conformity of them to the Præceptive Part of the Law, but chiefly from their *Conformity to the Rule of the Grace of the Promise*, p. 58.

How to Explain this Distinction between the *Rule of the Precept*; and the *Rule of the Grace of the Promise*, I cannot see

see how it can be done better than it is by *Wolzenigenius*, one of the *Fratres Poloni*, who hath very exactly Delivered the *Socinian* (which I take to be Mr. *Williams* his) Sense, to this Effect. 'In every well constituted Government there are *Laws*, or *Rules of Two sorts*. The First are such as show the Subjects Duty, *what he must do*, and what he must not do. — Then there are *Rules*, by which Rewards are Proposed for the Encouragement of Obedience. — *Hæc duo Legum genere reperiuntur etiam in Regni Christi* — For Christ (saith he) is our King, but so that he is at the same time our Father and Faithful Pastor. His Promises are Limited by certain Conditions; and yet these Conditions are not over-rigidly insisted on in those Cases, where somewhat of Ignorance, or other Infirmities intervenes. The Promise of Eternal Life Requires an Observation of his Commands; but he knowing our Frailties will not Impute to us our Daily Sins, if so be there Remain in us a Sincere and Upright Heart, True Repentance, and a Certain Purpose of Amendment. *Wolzog. Instruct. ad Util. Lect. lib. N. T. cap. 4. & 6.*

That this is Mr. *Williams*'s Sense appears clearly on an Observing how much he Insists on the *Rule of the Grace of the Promise*, as it accepts of our Faith, Repentance, and sincere Obedience for the sake of Christ, notwithstanding our many Frailties, Failings and Infirmities.

Mr. *Williams*.

' The main of our Ministry consists in pressing Men to Answer the Rule of the Gospel, &c. *Pref. to Gosp. Tr.* p. 9. The Blessings promised on the Conditions of the Covenant of Grace, are meerly of Grace: They be for another's sake, and not our own, p. 57. The Gospel
' Pro-

‘ Promise being the ~~way~~ which Christ Appoints to *Dispence Saving Benefits to Sinners*, must have the same Rules with the Covenant of Grace : ——— This Gospel promiseth its Benefit to such as do Believe ——— It Invests Believers in those Saving Benefits. — p. 65, &c. This Covenant is *the Way*, &c.

Father *Alsop*.

‘ His Description of the Covenant is this; *A Promise of the Pardon of Sin, and Eternal Life to those, who believe, and obey the Gospel*. [A more full Description than Mr. *Williams* gives in his Answer to the Question, *What is the Covenant of Grace?* yet saith Father *Alsop*] ‘ A Description so liable to *Exceptions*, that it Describes neither ‘ the whole of the Covenant, nor a *New Covenant*, nor ‘ (upon the matter) any Covenant at all.

‘ 1. This Description gives us little, very little of the ‘ *True Covenant of Grace*: For, (1.) Tho he thinks to ‘ put us off with a Promise of Pardon, and Life to those, ‘ who believe and obey, the true Covenant of Grace, hath ‘ given us a Promise of that Faith, whereby we may be- ‘ lieve, and of that New Heart, whereby we are Enabled ‘ to obey the Gospel. And first we have a Promise ‘ of the Right Faith, made to us in the *True Covenant*, ‘ John 6. 37. Eph. 2. 8. — We have a Direct and Ex- ‘ press Promise too of the New Heart, Ezek. 36. Heb. ‘ 8. 10. —

2. ‘ As it Describes not the whole of the Covenant, so it ‘ Describes not the Nature of a *New Covenant*, &c.

3. ‘ Upon

3. ' Upon the matter it's *no Covenant of Grace at all.*
 ' For, (1.) A *Promise of Pardon and Life upon Condition*
 ' of *Believing and Obeying*, is neither *better, nor worse* than
 ' a *Threatning of Condemnation and Death*, to them who
 ' *Believe not, and Obey not.* It may with equal right be
 ' called a *Threatning of Death*; as a *Promise of Life*: It's
 ' no more a *Covenant of Grace*, than a *Covenant of Wrath.*
 ' *Anti-Sozzo.* p. 580, 581, &c.

There are other Notions in the Writings of Mr. *Williams* confuted by what is in Father *Alsop's* *Anti-Sozzo*, which at this time I Forbeare to mention, tho a Small Invitation will draw them out, and a great deale more in Some Points of weight wherein he Differs from the most Eminent Reformers; under whose shaddow according to his Deceitfull ways he Endeavours to shelter himself, whilst it is his *Unwearyed Labour* to subvert the common Faith of Protestants. In the mean time I do solemnly Protest (to use Father *Alsop's* own words) That as I have no Personal Quarrel with this Gentleman, so I have not willingly wronged his Discourse in the smallest Instance: The worst I wish him, is, That he may Seasonably Repent of his Injurious Dealing, and his Unworthy Treatment of those Persons, who have Deserved well of Religion and the Commonwealth of Learning, and not ill of himself, particularly of his Ungenteel, not to say Unkind and Unchristian Carriage towards that Learned, that Holy, that Modest and Humble Mr. *Sylvester*, between whom and Mr. *Baxter* he Sneakingly, and with Unmanly Flattery, worm'd himself into the Good Old Gentleman's Opinion, and by unwearied Begging, Prevail'd to be the Man to supply his Absence at *Pinnors-Hall* Lecture, to the End he might make his way the more Plain and Easy for the

G

thrust-

thrusting himself into the same Lecture on the Decease of that Great and Good Man, and have the better opportunity to play those Pranks he has since done, to the breaking once an Hopeful Union; and according to his *Irish* Practices, cause Divisions amongst you, to the great Dishonour of God, the Reproach of Religion, the Ruine of Mens Souls, as well as to the Grief of the most Godly, and Triumph of the Wicked and Profane.

All that remains, were to do Right to your Merit, and to Testify the Esteem I have for your Learning and Piety, tho wholly unknown to you, but that I am informed there is a Person, who hath out of Duty to God, Veneration for Holy Ministers, and Kindness to the Generation of the Righteous, undertaken it; and who I doubt not will express the same concern for the Vindication of your Pastoral Wisdom and Conduct, as might be expected from,

S I R,

Your Unworthy Brother,

and Servant.
